Comments on JAS-D-20-0297\_R2 submitted by Wagner et al.

The structure of the revised version (i.e., Section 4) has been greatly improved, which makes reading much easier. I do not have more scientific questions now. The manuscript is suggested to be accepted by JAS for publication after a minor revision

1. Section 2, Part b, Instrumentation. I should ask this question in the previous review(s). I do still feel that the description of instrumentation seems has too many details given the focus of this study. To me, Table 2 is sufficient to know the instrumentation. It will be helpful if the authors can simplify the description of instrumentation slightly. For instance, I am not sure how many readers are interested in so detailed description of instrumentation as presented in Lines 198-201 and L204-209.
2. L182: The a priori temperature … I am not sure that you need “the” here.
3. L244: It is not clear the difference between local time and LST (Local Standard Time). In addition, please make sure that LST is defined at its first use.
4. L279: “were” should be “are” for consistency with another “are” in the same sentence?
5. L303-308: Any explanation of a decrease in mixing ratio with LBA at Sheboygan site? Is it because of less evaporation with lower lake surface near this site?
6. L350: brings with it 🡪 bring with. Please delete “it” if I do not misunderstand.
7. L456: “extend hundreds of kilometers inland”. Here “hundreds of kilometers” seems to be too many for Lake Breeze traveling inland unless the authors may provide reliable reference(s).
8. I am not sure that you need to add dot in all the panel labels in Figures 2-4, and 6-7. For instance, “a)” should be more commonly used than “a.)”?